



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,025	07/13/2001	Tamer Elsawy	SCP-5020	3078

7590                    07/08/2003

Stallman & Pollock LLP  
Suite 290  
121 Spear Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105

EXAMINER
----------

EL ARINI, ZEINAB

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1746

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2003

PO

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/905,025	ELSAWY ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Zeinab E. EL-Arini	1746

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 51-101 and 112-185 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 51-101 and 112-185 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>10</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## **DETAILED ACTION**

**The amendment and remarks filed April 22, 2003 have been acknowledged and entered.**

Claims 102- 111 have been cancelled.

Claims 51-101 and 112-185 are pending.

The obviousness-type double patenting rejection stated in paper No, 6 is maintained, because the terminal disclaimer is not proper. This is because the attorney is not of record in the oath/ declaration or a separate paper filed appointing a new associate attorney, nor is there a customer number.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) stated in paper No. 6 has been withdrawn in view of applicants' remarks.

### ***Specification***

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of the phrase "The present apparatus is a method and system". Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 51-59, 74-83, 100-101, 112-118, 120, 123-125, 135- 141, 143- 150, 152-159, and 161-168 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujikawa et al.

Fujikawa et al. as discussed supra in paper No. 6 teach a method of rinsing and drying a substrate. The reference teaches all limitation with the exception of after discharging the process fluid from the vessel, introducing a drying vapor into the system.

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to use the process taught by Fujikawa et al to obtain the claimed process, because it is functionally equivalent to the claimed process. This is because Fujikawa et al. disclose that a substrate is rinsed by being immersed in the up flow of deionized water. After rinsing, the substrate is removed from deionized water, and at this time the surroundings of the substrate are supplied with vapor of an organic solvent. Introducing the drying vapor to the substrate after removing the substrate from rinsing liquid is functionally equivalent to after discharging the process fluid introducing the drying vapor into the system. See the abstract and the document in general.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 51, 56, 61- 63, 68, and 112, 114 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takase et al. (6,152,153) new reference.

Takase et al. teach substrate cleaning/ drying equipment and substrate cleaning/ drying method. The reference teaches providing a system comprising a vessel and at least one object having surface; exposing the object to the process fluid; discharging the process fluid; and after discharging the process fluid from the vessel, introducing the drying vapor into the system as claimed. See Figs. 2, 6, 7, col. 8, lines 59-67, the abstract, and the document in general.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 51-101, and 112-185 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zeinab EL-Arini whose telephone number is (703)308-3320. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on (703)308-4333. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)872-9310 for regular communications and (703)872-9311 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number:  
09/905,025  
Art Unit: 1746

Page 5

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0661.

ZEE  
June 30, 2003

*zeinab Elarini*

**ZEHNAB EL-ARINI**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**